

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application as presently amended and in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-11 are pending in the present application. Claims 1 and 3-9 are amended, and Claims 10 and 11 are added by the present amendment. The addition of Claims 10 and 11 is supported by the originally filed specification and does not introduce any new matter.

In the outstanding Office Action, the Abstract was objected to; Claims 1-7 and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Applicants' background art in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,281,863 to Sasaki et al. (hereinafter "Sasaki"); and Claim 8 was objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form.

Applicants' representatives thank Examiner Laneau for the interview granted on February 3, 2004, and previously scheduled for January 27, 2004. During that interview, the outstanding rejections were discussed in detail for each of the independent claims. The present response sets forth the substance of those discussions, which Examiner Laneau agreed shows that the claims are patentable over the applied references.

Addressing now the rejection of Claim 1 under § 103(a) as unpatentable over Applicants' background art in view of Sasaki, that rejection is respectfully traversed. Independent Claim 1 is directed to a method for driving a display panel, in which a common electrode and a discrete electrode are connected to one of plural display cells arranged in a matrix form. The method includes, *inter alia*, the steps of: (a) supplying the common electrode with a reset pulse opposite in polarity to a display pulse, the reset pulse for inversion of charges stored on the common electrode; and (b) supplying the common electrode with a single-step pulse of the same polarity as the display pulse.

As discussed during the interview with respect to Claim 1, such steps can be used when addressing a false discharge problem, which may occur when using a two-step display pulse. Further, there is insufficient motivation to combine Applicants' background art and Sasaki, because the Office Action has not met its burden of proof to show that modifying the background art to apply Sasaki's full writing pulse in lieu of a two-step initialization pulse would improve display contrast.<sup>1</sup> Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the § 103(a) rejection of independent Claim 1, and Claims 2-3 depending therefrom, be withdrawn.

Addressing now the rejection of Claim 4 under § 103(a) as unpatentable over Applicants' background art in view of Sasaki, that rejection is respectfully traversed. Claim 4 is amended to depend from independent Claim 1. As originally presented, Claim 4 was directed to a method reciting features similar to those of Claim 1. However, in addition to the first single-step pulse of step (b), Claim 4 further recites (as originally and presently presented) a similar second single-step pulse that rises within 1  $\mu$ s after the rise of the first single-step pulse. By applying the second single-step pulse within 1  $\mu$ s of the first single-step pulse, the problem of false discharge can be similarly addressed in the manner described above.<sup>2</sup> As discussed during the interview, neither Applicant's background art nor Sasaki teaches a dual-step pulse having first and second single-step pulses rising within 1  $\mu$ s of each other. Further, for the reasons stated above, the Office Action has not met its burden of proof to show that there is sufficient motivation to combine Applicants' background art and Sasaki. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the § 103(a) rejection of independent Claim 4 be withdrawn.

Addressing now the rejection of Claim 5 under § 103(a) as unpatentable over Applicants' background art in view of Sasaki, that rejection is respectfully traversed. Independent Claim 5 is also directed also method for driving a display panel. As discussed

---

<sup>1</sup> Office Action, 1/2/2004, page 3.

<sup>2</sup> Specification, page 18, lines 6-8.

during the interview, neither Applicant's background art nor Sasaki teaches the claimed data transfer period. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the § 103(a) rejection of independent Claim 5, and Claim 6 depending therefrom, be withdrawn.

Addressing now the rejection of Claim 7 under § 103(a) as unpatentable over Applicants' background art in view of Sasaki, that rejection is respectfully traversed. Independent Claim 7 is also directed to a method for driving a display panel. The method includes, *inter alia*, applying an initialization sequence voltage and a display pulse to the common electrode; and applying a discharge suppression pulse to the discrete electrode. In Sasaki, assuming that the Office Action is alleging that the full writing pulse 2 corresponds to the claimed display pulse, it is noted that the full writing pulse 2 is applied to the independent electrode (see Figure 9(b)), rather than common electrode as claimed.<sup>3</sup> Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the § 103(a) rejection of independent Claim 7 be withdrawn.

Addressing now the rejection of Claim 9 under § 103(a) as unpatentable over Applicants' background art in view of Sasaki, that rejection is respectfully traversed. Claim 9 is directed to a method for driving a display panel. The method includes, *inter alia*, the step of removing charges that trigger an unintended discharge of one of plural display cells during a stabilization period, in which voltages are not applied to either the common electrode or the discrete electrode. Claim 9 is believed to be patentable in light of the recitation of a stabilization period similar to the stabilization period of Claim 8, which was indicated as allowable. Further, for the reasons stated above, the Office Action has not met its burden of proof to show that there is sufficient motivation to combine Applicants' background art and Sasaki. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the § 103(a) rejection of independent Claim 9 be withdrawn.

---

<sup>3</sup> Sasaki, col. 4, line 60 – col. 5, line 2.

New dependent Claims 10 and 11 are added to provide an alternate scope of protection as compared to independent Claims 1 and 4, respectively. New Claim 10 recites that a ratio of a first duration of the reset pulse, to a second duration from termination of the display pulse to the start of the reset pulse, is approximately 3:1.<sup>4</sup> New Claim 11 recites that the first and second pulses of the two-step pulse fall within 1  $\mu$ s of one another.<sup>5</sup> Applicants respectfully submit that the features of new Claims 10 and 11 further distinguish over the applied art.

Consequently, in light of the above discussion and in view of the present amendment, the present application is believed to be in condition for allowance, and an early and favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,  
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Eckhard H. Kuesters  
Attorney of Record  
Registration No. 28,870

Michael R. Casey, Ph. D.  
Registration No. 40,294

Customer Number

**22850**

Tel: (703) 413-3000  
Fax: (703) 413 -2220  
(OSMMN 08/03)

EHK/MRC/STD/mac  
I:\ATTY\STD\21'S\217374US\217374US.MOD AM.DOC

<sup>4</sup> For support, see Specification, page 16, line 26 – page 17, line 1.

<sup>5</sup> For support, see Specification page 18, lines 9-13.